

**Remarks**

Reconsideration and allowance of this application, as amended, are respectfully requested.

Claims 1-8 have been amended and new claims 9-14 have been added. Claims 1-14 are now pending in the application. Claims 1, 6, 9, 11, and 14 are independent. The rejections are respectfully submitted to be obviated in view of the amendments and remarks presented herein. No new matter has been introduced through the foregoing amendments.

Claims 1-8 have been amended to more fully comply with U.S. practice and for enhanced readability. New claims 9-14 have been added to further define the scope of protection sought for Applicants' invention. Entry of each of the amendments is respectfully requested.

35 U.S.C. § 103(a) - Hart, Abe, and Cuthbertson

Claims 1-5 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,921,911 to Hart in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,042,528 to Abe and U.S. Patent No. 3,700,400 to Cuthbertson.

The rejection of claims 1-5 under § 103(a) based on Hart, Abe, and Cuthbertson is respectfully traversed. For at least the following reasons, the combined disclosures of Hart, Abe, and

Cuthbertson would not have rendered obvious Applicants' claimed invention.

There is simply no teaching in any of Hart, Abe, and Cuthbertson that would have led one to select the references and combine them in a way that would produce the invention defined by any of Applicants' pending claims. First, Hart may disclose a method of inhibiting foam formation in an amine stripper, but, as acknowledged by the examiner, there is no teaching of Applicants' claimed method feature of contacting a raw gas with an aqueous alkanolamine solution that includes "a composition having an organopolysiloxane with a polyoxyalkylene group and a fine silica powder" (claim 1).

Second, Abe and Cuthbertson are directed to a technical area (high-temperature dyeing and textile treating) that is completely different from that of Applicants' claimed invention (absorption of acid gas). Abe may disclose a water soluble defoaming agent, but only in the context of "reducing the formation of foams particularly in a high-temperature dyeing bath" (abstract). Similarly, Cuthbertson may disclose an antifoaming composition, but only in the context of "jet dyeing" (abstract). Neither Abe nor Cuthbertson addresses the issues associated with the absorption of acid gas.

Therefore, the combined disclosures of Hart, Abe, and Cuthbertson would not have rendered obvious the invention defined by any of claims 1-5.

35 U.S.C. § 103(a) - Hart, Abe, Cuthbertson, and Rooney

Claims 6-8 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hart in view of Abe and Cuthbertson and further in view of WO 00/18493 of Rooney.

For all of the reasons identified above in response to the rejection of claims 1-5, the rejection of claims 6-8 under § 103(a) based on Hart, Abe, Cuthbertson, and Rooney is respectfully traversed. Furthermore, regardless of what Rooney may disclose with regard to the amount of alkanolamine needed to remove acid gases from a fluid stream, there is no teaching whatsoever that would have led one to supplement the deficiencies of Rooney's teaching with the teachings of Abe and Cuthbertson, which, as indicted above, are directed to a different technical area (high-temperature dyeing and textile treating).

Therefore, the combined disclosures of Hart, Abe, Cuthbertson, and Rooney would not have rendered obvious the invention defined by any of claims 6-8.


New claims 9-14 have been added to further define the scope of protection sought for Applicants' invention. New claims 9-14 are also allowable. Since independent claims 9, 11, and 14 include at least the features discussed above with respect to the rejections based on Hart, Abe, Cuthbertson, and Rooney, the references neither anticipate nor would have rendered obvious the invention defined by any of claims 9-14.

U.S. Appln. No.: 10/531,719  
Atty. Docket No.: P70462US0

In view of the foregoing, this application is now in condition for allowance. If the examiner believes that an interview might expedite prosecution, the examiner is invited to contact the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

JACOBSON HOLMAN PLLC

By:   
Harvey B. Jacobson, Jr.  
Reg. No. 20,851

400 Seventh Street, N. W.  
Washington, D.C. 20004  
Telephone: (202) 638-6666  
Date: March 31, 2008